UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,694	01/18/2001	Thomas Dean Christopherson	ROC920000136US1	6908

7590 02/10/2005

LISA PLANK
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION
IP LAW, DEPT. 917, BLDG. 006-1
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH
ROCHESTER,, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER	
DADA, BEEMNET W	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/764,694	CHRISTOPHERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Beemnet W Dada	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in reply to an amendment filed on August 24, 2004. Claims 1, 6-45 are amended and new claims 46-51 are added. Claims 1-51 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 8, 16-18, 23, 31-33, 38 and 46-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arrouye et al (hereinafter Arrouye), US Patent 6,256,635, in view of Hunnicutt et al (hereinafter Hunnicutt), US Patent 5,889,952 and further in view of Bahlmann et al (hereinafter Bahlmann) US Patent 6,170,008 B1.

4. As per claims 1, 16, and 31, Arrouye discloses a means of configuring a client computer connected to a network, wherein a remote computer is capable of communicating with the client computer over the network (see for example, abstract), comprising:

storing sets of configuration parameters in a non-volatile storage unit (see for example; col 7 ln 43-57) and col 8 ln 35-47) wherein the sets of configuration parameters instruct at least one program how to initialize operational parameters and load programs into the client computer memory during a power on (see for example; col 1 ln 54-57). Arrouye discloses means of

configuring a computer to operate under different environments. The means of such configuration parameters is well known in the art to be used by a computer system during a power on in order to configure the computer according to the specified parameters. Furthermore, such configuration parameters are well known in the art to be used by a program (boot program) during a power on to specify programs to load and initializing operational parameters.

As for each set of configuration parameters, storing a token in the nonvolatile storage unit indicating access rights to the set of configuration parameters, wherein the token specifies whether management entities running on the remote computer and client computer can access the set of configuration parameters for that token. Arrouye further discloses storing sets of configuration parameters as configuration files (see for example; col 7 In 43-62), however Arrouye is silent on such use of tokens. Hunnicutt discloses a means of access rights on files by storing a token in a non-volatile storage unit (see for example; col 4 In 44-55 and figs 3 and 4), wherein the token specifies whether management entities can access the files (see for example; col 5 In 26-50 and figs 3 and 4). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have realized the use of tokens for access rights on files to be used on the configuration files of Arrouye. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Hunnicutt within the system of Arrouye because it would have provided a means of controlling entities who have access to change such parameters thus increasing security of the system.

The combination of Arrouye and Hunnicutt is silent on if configuration parameters are overlapping then a first management entity running on the remote computer and a second a second management entity running on the client computer can configure a same set of configuration parameters. However Bahlmann teaches a method for building boot file, including

network specific and client specific parameters necessary to build a boot file are configured in a client computer, further including configuring additional parameters and default parameters in the client device [see column 2, lines 13-19 and column 4, lines 51-67]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Bahlmann within the combination of Arrouye and Hunnicutt in order to allow configuration of parameters that are overlapping.

5. As per claims 2, 17, 32 and 46-51 Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann discloses the claimed limitations above (see claim 1). Hunnicutt further discloses wherein each token specifies at least one management entity (see for example; col 4 ln 5-21), wherein only the management entity specified in the token has access rights to the set of configuration parameters associated with that token (see for example; col 4 ln 56-col 5 ln 7; the use of tokens in preventing unauthorized access is well known in the art to only allow the specified entity in the token to have access rights to the file as the purpose of such tokens), As for at least one token specifies one management entity at the client computer and at least one other token specifies one management entity at the remote computer. Hunnicutt discloses access tokens for each user (see for example; col 3 ln 58-64 and col 4 ln 5-21). Arrouye further discloses an entity at the client computer and one at a remote computer (see for example; col 3 ln 38-46). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have realized entities at a client computer and remote computer for configuration purposes and thus will need tokens for access to configuration files.

6. As per claims 3, 18, and 33, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann discloses the claimed

limitations above (see claim 1). As for wherein the at least one program is capable of comprising a boot program, operating system, or application program, Arrouye concentrates on configuring network operational parameters (see for example; col 13 ln 30-45). Such network settings are well known in the art to be configured by a boot program or operating system during a system power-on. Therefore, the at least one program being capable of comprising a boot program or operating system is well known in the art to the teachings of Arrouye as the purpose for such configuration parameters. Arrouye further discloses configuration parameters for different computer settings (see for example; col 3 ln 39-46). The use of configuration parameters for instructing application applications on loading operational parameters and programs for an application running on the client computer is well known in the art of computer configuration. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for the at least one program to comprise an application program because it would have provided a means of configuring different applications in a client computer and thus add versatility and thoroughness to the configuration of a computer in the Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann combination.

7. As per claim 8, 23, and 38, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann discloses the claimed limitations above (see claim 1). Arrouye further discloses wherein the sets of configuration include at least one of the following sets of configuration parameters: network configuration parameters indicating network settings the client computer uses to communicate over the network (see for example; col 7 ln 42-58). As for operating system configuration parameters for an operating system loaded into the client computer memory; application configuration parameters indicating parameters for application programs loaded into the client computer memory; user configuration parameters indicating settings for a user interface displaying the

client computer; and Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) configuration parameters, Arrouye further discloses configuration of any system settings. Such sets of configuration parameters are well known in the art as being part of parameters that can be set according to a configuration parameter. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have recognized the sets of parameters as being other computer settings that are configurable through the teachings of Arrouye.

8. Claims 4-5, 19-20, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arrouye et al (hereinafter Arrouye), US Patent 6,256,635, in view of Hunnicutt et al (hereinafter Hunnicutt), US Patent 5,889,952, and further in view of Bahlmann et al (hereinafter Bahlmann) US Patent 6,170,008 B1 as applied above and further in view of Nishiyama, US Patent 5,778,365.

9. As per claims 4, 19, and 34, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann discloses the claimed limitations above (see claim 1). Hunnicutt further discloses modification of the access rights specified in the token (see for example; col 7 In 5-31) comprising storing modifications in the non-volatile storage unit from the client computer or remote computer to the access rights specified in the token for one set of configuration parameters (see for example; col 5 In 7-24 and col 6 In 66-col 7 In 31). Hunnicutt discloses that access rights for the tokens are stored in nonvolatile memory (see for example; col 4 In 44-55). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have realized such modifications of access rights to be stored in the same non-volatile memory such that new memory mappings to the modified access rights are not needed. Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann is silent on the modifications being made to the token if the client computer or remote computer initiating the modifications is indicated in the

access tokens as having write access. Nishiyama further discloses a means of access control to files including modifying access rights only if the client computer or remote computer initiating the modifications is indicated in the access writes as having permission as being well known in the art (see for example; col 1 In 21-31). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have realized the need to control which entity has a right to change access rights according to a specified parameter in the access control of the token. Means of using write permission or an additional field, such as "change access right" of Nishiyama, for implementing such modification control is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Nishiyama within the Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann combination because it would have provided a means of security to the access right modification so that no unauthorized entity can change access rights on a parameter.

10. As per claim 5, 20, and 35, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann-Nishiyama discloses the claimed limitations above (see claim 4). As for the access rights in one token specify one application program in the remote computer or client program that can modify the set of configuration parameters. Hunnicutt discloses modification of the access rights specified in the token (see for example; col 7 In 5-31). Such modification being done through an application as being well known in the art. Nishiyama further discloses a means of access control to files including modifying access rights only if the client computer or remote computer initiating the modifications is indicated in the access writes as having permission as being well known in the art (see for example; col 1 In 21-31). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have realized the modification being done through an application program and in controlling the modification of access rights according to users also pertaining to the

applications the user uses.

11. Claims 6 -7 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arrouye et al (hereinafter Arrouye), US Patent 6,256,635, in view of Hunnicutt et al (hereinafter Hunnicutt), US Patent 5,889,952, and further in view of Bahlmann US Patent 6,170,008 B1 as applied above and further in view of Bourke-Dunphy et al (hereinafter Bourke), US Patent 6,449,642.

12. As per claims 6 and 36, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann discloses the claimed limitations above (see claim 1). Arrouye further discloses launching a configuration program from, wherein the configuration program is used to modify sets of configuration parameters in the non-volatile storage unit (see for example; col 9 In 15-26 and col 10 In 20-39). Modification of such configuration parameters will require a program to perform such changes in the configuration parameters. Therefore a configuration program for performing such modifications is inherent to the teachings of Arrouye. Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann does not explicitly teach launching the configuration program from a removable storage unit interfaced with the client computer. Bourke discloses a means of configuring a client computer wherein programs are stored on a removable storage unit (see for example; col 3 In 57-65). A configuration program is a program that can be stored by any means necessary. The storage of such a program on a removable storage unit adds convenience to the system through making the program portable for use with other computers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Bourke within the system of Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann because it would have provided a convenience through the portability of such programs between computers.

13. As per claims 7 and 37, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann discloses the claimed limitations above (see claim 6). Arrouye is further discloses a setup program (see for example; col 10 ln 55-60). However, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann is silent on launching a setup program from the removable storage unit during a power on when the client computer has not previously been configured. Bourke further discloses such a launching of a setup program (see for example; col 4 ln 40-51) comprising: receiving settings for at least one set of configuration parameters via the setup program (see for example; col 4 ln 40-45) As for storing the received settings in the non-volatile storage unit, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have realized such storing of settings in the non-volatile storage unit of Arrouye for further system processing of the configuration. Bourke further discloses the configuration program being launched to provide an interface to allow the user to set configuration parameters for other sets of configuration parameters (see for example; col 4 ln 52-64). Arrouye discloses use of a configuration program to set configuration parameters as described above. Arrouye further discloses a need of initial configuration of a client computer for performing future configuration (see for example; col 10 ln 41-60). However, Arrouye is silent on the specifics of initial configuration. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to employ the startup program of Bourke to further configure the client's computer before initial configuration and provide a configuration program of Arrouye to further configure the computer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Bourke within the Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann combination because it would have provided a means of an initial configuration of a client computer to allow for further configuration of other settings of a client computer through a program thus minimizing user interaction during initial setup.

14. Claims 9-10, 24-25, and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(x) as being unpatentable over Arrouye et al (hereinafter Arrouye), US Patent 6,256,635, in view of Hunnicutt et al (hereinafter Hunnicutt), US Patent 5,889,952, and further in view of Bahlmann et al US Patent 6,170,008 B1 as applied above and further in view of Bourke-Dunphy et al (hereinafter Bourke), US Patent 6,449,642, and further in view of Piazza et al (hereinafter Piazza), US Patent 6,026,438.

15. As per claims 9, 24, and 39, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann discloses the claimed limitations above (see claim 1). Arrouye further discloses storing configuration parameters in a non-volatile storage unit (see for example; col 9 ln 15-25 and col 10- ln 48-60) and network configuration parameters (see for example; col 3 ln 3947). Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann does not explicitly teach launching a setup program from the removable storage unit during a power on when the client computer has not previously been configured; receiving settings for network configuration parameters indicating a network address for the client computer through the setup program; receiving operating system configuration parameters for an operating system kernel to load into the client computer memory through the setup program. Bourke discloses a means of system configuration including such launchings means (see for example; 4 ln 40-51). Bourke further discloses a means of receiving settings for network configuration parameters indicating a network address for the client computer through the setup program (see for example; col 4 ln 40-51). Arrouye further discloses a need of initial configuration of a client computer for performing future configuration (see for example; col 10 ln 41-60). However, Arrouye is silent on the specifics of initial configuration, One of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to employ the startup program of Bourke to further configure the client's computer to provide for

such remote configuration. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Bourke within the Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann combination because it would have provided a means of an initial configuration of a client computer to allow for remote configuration of other settings of a client computer through a program thus minimizing user interaction during initial setup. As for receiving operating system configuration parameters for an operating system kernel to load into the client computer memory through the setup program, Arrouye further discloses configuring any type of system setting (see for example; col 3 ln 39-47). Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann - Bourke is silent on such parameters for an operating system kernel. Piazza discloses a means of configuring a client computer including receiving such operating system configuration parameters through a setup program (see for example; col 3 ln 2835 and col 6 ln 21-57). Piazza further discloses that operating system attributes of a client computer must be configured to insure proper performance, including operating system parameters (see for example; col 1 ln 30-35). Arrouye further discloses the configuration of any system setting (see for example; col 3 ln 3947). Operating system parameters are well known in the art to be a system setting and need to be configured to insure proper operation of the operating system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Piazza within the Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann-Bourke combination because it would have provided a means of performing configuration of an operating system during initial setup of a client computer to insure proper operation and performance.

16. As per claims 10, 25, and 40, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann -Bourke-Piazza discloses the claimed limitations above (see for claim 9). Arrouye further discloses launching a configuration program (see for example; col 14 ln 1-18). Bourke further discloses launching a

configuration program from the setup program to receive application configuration parameters for application programs to load into the client computer memory (see for example; col 4 ln 40-51). As for user interface configuration parameters, Arrouye further discloses the configuration of any system setting (see for example; col 3 ln 39-47). User interface configuration parameters are well known in the art to be a type of system setting that is configured for a user to view and must be present in such startup programs in order to allow viewing of information on display.

17. Claims 11, 13-15, 26, 28-30, 41, and 43-45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arrouye et al (hereinafter Arrouye), US Patent 6,256,635, in view of Hunnicutt et al (hereinafter Hunnicutt), US Patent 5,889,952 and further in view of Bahlmann US Patent 6,170,008 B1 as applied above, and further in view of Piazza et al (hereinafter Piazza), US Patent 6,026,438.

18. As per claims 11, 26, and 41, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann discloses the claimed limitations above (see for claim 1). Arrouye further discloses loading network configuration parameters stored in the non-volatile storage (see for example; col 1 ln 52-60). Such loading and beginning an initialization routine after a power on event, wherein if the client computer was previously configured is well known in the art as to how a computer is started according to configuration parameters. Arrouye discloses configuration of any system setting including network configuration (see for example; col 3 ln 39-47), therefore one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have realized such loading of network configurations in an initialization routine to be inherent to the operation of a computer that is configured according to Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann. As for loading network configuration parameters stored in the non-volatile storage unit indicating a network address for the client

computer to use; and loading operating system configuration parameters when loading an operating system kernel. Piazza further discloses such loading (see for example; col 3 ln 21-33 and col 6 ln 21-56). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have recognized the purpose of configuring computers is for the loading of such configuration parameters during a system initialization so that the configuration of the system is effective. Piazza further discloses that operating system attributes of a client computer must be configured to insure proper performance (see for example; col 1 ln 30-35). Such loading of operating system configuration parameters can be done as additional configuration of system settings of Arrouye. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Piazza within the Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann combination because it would have provided a means of performing configuration of an operating system during initial setup of a client computer to insure proper operation and performance.

19. As per claim 13, 28, and 43, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann -Piazza discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 11). Piazza further discloses wherein the operating system configuration parameters indicate a remote server on the network including the operating system kernel (see for example; col 9 ln 62-col 10 ln 2), further comprising the initialization: downloading the operating system kernel from the remote server indicated in the operating system configuration parameters (see for example; col 3 ln 21-36 and col 9 ln 55-60); and loading the downloaded operating system kernel into the client computer (see for example; col 9 ln 66-col 10 ln 4).

20. As per claim 14, 29, and 44, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann -Piazza discloses the claimed

limitations as described above (see claim 11). Piazza further discloses loading at least one application program indicated in the application configuration parameters into the memory of the client computer (see for example; col 10 In 349). Loading of programs according to configuration parameters is well known in the art to be the purpose of such parameters and system settings. Piazza further discloses that client computer must be configured to insure proper performance, including application settings (see for example; col 1 In 30-35). Such loading of application programs indicated by application program parameters can be done as additional configuration of system settings of Arrouye. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Piazza within the Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann combination because it would have provided a means of performing proper loading of application programs according to system settings to insure proper operation and performance.

21. As per claim 15, 30, and 45, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann -Piazza discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 14). Piazza further discloses accessing the at least one application program from a remote server over the network or from the removable storage unit interfacing with the client computer (see for example; col 10 In 3-47), wherein the accessed at least one application program is loaded into the client computer memory (see for example; col 10 In 45-49).

22. Claims 12 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arrouye et al (hereinafter Arrouye), US Patent 6,256,635, in view of Hunnicutt et al (hereinafter Hunnicutt), US Patent 5,889,952, in view of Piazza et al (hereinafter Piazza), US Patent 6,026,438, and further in view of Bourke-Dunphy et al (hereinafter Bourke), US Patent

6,449,642.

23. As per claims 12 and 27, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann -Piazza discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 11). Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann -Piazza is silent on operating system is loaded from the removable storage unit interfacing with the client computer. Bourke discloses a means of configuring a computer wherein the operating system is loaded from the removable storage unit interfacing with the client computer (see for example; col 3 In 57-65). Operating systems are well known in the art to be loaded from any type of storage unit. The use of removable storage unit is well known in the art to add convenience in ease of distributing programs from one computer to another. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Bourke within the Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann-Piazza combination because it would have provided a means of increase convenience and ease of use for a client to load an operating system.

24. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arrouye et al (hereinafter Arrouye), US Patent 6,256,635, in view of Hunnicutt et al (hereinafter Hunnicutt), US Patent 5,889,952, in view of Bahlmann US Patent 6,170,008 B1 and furhther in view of Nishiyama, US Patent 5,778,365, and further in view of Bourke-Dunphy et al (hereinafter Bourke), US Patent 6,449,642.

25. As per claim 21, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann -Nishiyama discloses the claimed limitations above (see claim 19). Arrouye further discloses launching a configuration program from, wherein the configuration program is used to modify sets of configuration parameters in

the non-volatile storage unit (see for example; col 9 ln 15-26 and col 10 ln 20-39). Modification of such configuration parameters will require a program to perform such changes in the configuration parameters. Therefore a configuration program for performing such modifications is inherent to the teachings of Arrouye. Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann-Nishiyama does not explicitly teach launching the configuration program from a removable storage unit interfaced with the client computer. Bourke discloses a means of configuring a client computer wherein programs are stored on a removable storage unit (see for example; col 3 ln 57-65). A configuration program is a program that can be stored by any means necessary. The storage of such a program on a removable storage unit adds convenience to the system through making the program portable for use with other computers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Bourke within the system of Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann-Nishiyama because it would have provided a convenience through the portability of such programs between computers.

26. As per claim 22, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann-Nishiyama discloses the claimed limitations above (see claim 21). Arrouye is further discloses a setup program (see for example; col 10 ln 55-60). However, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann-Nishiyama is silent on launching a setup program from the removable storage unit during a power on when the client computer has not previously been configured. Bourke further discloses such a launching of a setup program (see for example; col 4 ln 40-51) comprising: receiving settings for at least one set of configuration parameters via the setup program (see for example; col 4 ln 40-45) As for storing the received settings in the non-volatile storage unit, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have realized such storing of settings in the non-volatile storage unit of Arrouye for further system processing of the configuration. Bourke further discloses the

configuration program being launched to provide an interface to allow the user to set configuration parameters for other sets of configuration parameters (see for example; col 4 ln 52-64). Arrouye discloses use of a configuration program to set configuration parameters as described above. Arrouye further discloses a need of initial configuration of a client computer for performing future configuration (see for example; col 10 ln 41-60). However, Arrouye is silent on the specifics of initial configuration. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to employ the startup program of Bourke to further configure the client's computer before initial configuration and provide a configuration program of Arrouye to further configure the computer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Bourke within the Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann-Nishiyama combination because it would have provided a means of an initial configuration of a client computer to allow for further configuration of other settings of a client computer through a program thus minimizing user interaction during initial setup.

27. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arrouye et al (hereinafter Arrouye), US Patent 6,256,635, in view of Hunnicutt et al (hereinafter Hunnicutt), US Patent 5,889,952, and further in view of Bahlmann US Patent 6,170,008 and further in view of Bourke-Dunphy et al (hereinafter Bourke), US Patent 6,449,642.

28. As per claim 42, Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann discloses the claimed limitations as described above (see claim 31). Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann is silent on operating system being loaded from the removable storage unit interfacing with the client computer. Bourke discloses a means of configuring a computer wherein the operating system is loaded from the removable storage unit interfacing with the client computer (see for example; col 3 ln 57-65).

Operating systems are well known in the art to be loaded from any type of storage unit. The use of removable storage unit is well known in the art to add convenience in ease of distributing programs from one computer to another. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to combine the teachings of Bourke within the Arrouye-Hunnicutt-Bahlmann combination because it would have provided a means of increase convenience and ease of use for a client to load an operating system.

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

30. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beemnet W Dada whose telephone number is (571) 272-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (9:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Beemnet Dada

February 6, 2005

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100